

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE  
AMENDMENTS/REVISION LIST**

**6<sup>th</sup> December 2010**

PAGE NO.	LIST A	LIST B	AMENDMENTS
9		10/00254/FUL	<p>The Council has received an objection from the representative of Fordgate, Halton Lea management on the basis of the following;- there is no quantative or qualitative need for additional convenience floor space on this edge of centre site and as such it fails to meet the test of Policy TC1 of the UDP; the applicant has not taken into account the existing vacant units within the shopping centre in undertaking a sequential assessment; the applicant has failed to take into account the extant permission on East Lane; proposal is a stand alone development, physically separated from Halton Lea and would not facilitate any pedestrian linked trips to Halton Lea; the provision of floorspace outside the Centre will further threaten its vitality and viability and divert trade and associated footfall; will have a significant adverse impact upon in-centre trade and turnover due to the extend of diversion from the Centre; potential impact on Fordgate's planned private investment in the Centre; insufficient evidence to show compliance with the sequential approach; there is sufficient evidence to refuse the application; Contrary to the policies contained in PPS4.</p> <p>The Council has received an anonymous letter of objection – from 'parents and partners' of Lidl workers referring to the poor reputation of the company in the area of employee law and staff relations.</p>
22		10/00366/COU	<p>The Council has received an objection from Cheshire West &amp; Chester as follows; the proposal, with appropriate landscaping to the car parking area, would not result in any harm to the openness of the Green Belt;</p> <p>PPS4 states that "local planning authorities should take into account the importance of the shop, leisure facility or service to the local community or the</p>

			<p>economic base of the area if the proposal would result in its loss or change of use and refuse planning applications which fail to protect existing facilities which provide for people's day-to-day needs."</p> <p>Whilst not an essential community facility, the public house is currently operating and is therefore a valuable social asset and its loss should be resisted;</p> <p>There are no other public houses within easy walking distance of Dutton;</p> <p>Although the applicant states the business is operating at a loss, the application does not detail what measures, if any, the applicant has introduced to increase local support.</p> <p>A further 4 objections from residents from the Runcorn area received commenting on loss of the public house.</p>
31	10/00369/FUL		<p>Three further objections have been received from neighbours in relation to the loss of existing houses, destructive nature of the proposal. These include further comments received from the owner of number 175 following amendments to the scheme. Still raising concerns in relation to impact on 175, the design and appearance of plot 1, the potential imp-act on the boundary and drainage. These matters have already been addressed in the report.</p>
37		10/00400/FUL	
40	10/00407/FUL		
44		10/00419/OUT	
49		10/00446/EIA	<p>The following additional comments have been received:</p> <p><b>Environment Agency</b> - The will be acceptable provided conditions are attached in relation to being implemented in accordance with the flood risk assessment, surface water regulation, further details on</p>

			<p>contamination and remediation strategy, verification report on remediation, long term monitoring, maintenance and contingency for remediation, scheme to treat and remove solids from surface water run-off during construction work, scheme for foul and surface water drainage including oil and petrol interceptors, trapped gullies and roof drainage sealed at ground level.</p> <p>Further advice is provided as an informative to the applicant in relation to water abstraction licenses and Environmental Permits, and the requirement for site waste management plans.</p> <p>Further comments have been provided in relation to lighting and soft boundary screening treatment along the St Helens Canal. And that landscaping schemes shall include native planting.</p> <p><b>Natural England</b> – Have noted that the site is close to the Mersey Estuary Ramsar, Special Protection Area, and site of special scientific interest, it is there opinion that the proposal would not significantly affect this.</p> <p>They note that the proposal includes remediation of the site that will significantly improve quality of the shallow ground waters, removing direct discharges to controlled waters, and are pleased that this work is being carried out in consultation with the Councils contaminated Land Officer and the Environment Agency. They ask that relevant condition be attached to control this.</p> <p>They have noted that the air quality impact on the River Mersey SPA has not been assessed, but taking into account the type and of the development and the assessments / surveys carried out as part planning application they do not consider the proposal would have a significant impact on the River Mersey designated site relating to air quality.</p> <p>Noted that the ecological surveys conclude that no protected species would be affected. Though note that if in the event any are still found they should stop until further surveys are</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>carried out until suitable mitigation measures are put in place.</p> <p><b>Northwest Regional Development Agency</b> – The proposal fall outside of the scope that the NWDA would statutorily be consulted on. They have noted that the site is within the Widnes Waterfront EDZ, they have noted that the number of jobs to be generated is generally low compared to the size of the development, they wish to be assured that the proposal would not impact on the future development potential of the wider EDZ area. They look to the council to access the impact of the proposal including the traffic movements, if approved then the proposal should be satisfactory landscaped and operated in accordance with current best practice.</p> <p><b>British Waterways</b> – The proposal does not does not lie within the the consultation zone of any of any waterway, reservoir, canal, feeder, channel, water course, let off or culvert owned managed by British Water ways, they therefore have no comment.</p> <p>Since writing the officers report three further representations have been received from local residents and businesses. These raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The traffic would have a detrimental impact on the town, and causing congestion which would impact on the operation of existing businesses.</li> <li>• Concerns that perception of the waste resources park would have an impact on investment. Companies including Forward Partnership have invested in developing new office units which are vacant; the proposal would further prevent take business wanting to move into the units.</li> <li>• The proposal is contrary to the commitments of the Widnes Waterfront Masterplan which seeks high quality mixed uses, including offices business parks, residential leisure and retail.</li> </ul> <p><b>United Utilities</b> - Have no objection provided the site is drained on a separate system, with foul drainage</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>only connected to the foul sewer. The applicant should contact John Lunt at UU on 01925 537174.</p> <p>They note that the overall regeneration of the Widnes Regeneration Area requires a significant amount of water and the existing network will not support the total demand. Work is currently underway to provide a new connection of the large diameter main. Further information would be required from the developer before they know if the local mains can support this. The development could only be supplied once reinforcement has been installed.</p> <p><b>Knowsley</b> – No objection subject to Halton being satisfied that the proposal meets its own policy requirements and comments of MEAS.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service has provided advice on the application. They have noted that the application is the same as the previous in that it seeks permission for a Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) and in Vessel Composting (IVC) facility, the difference being that the throughput is reduced from 400,000 tpa to 200,000tpa and the access has been amended. MEAS consider the Environmental Statement to be acceptable and have no concerns in relation to the revised application. They note that there is a continued need for this facility in Merseyside and Halton.</p> <p>Finally, additional conditions are required in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contamination and remediation strategy</li> <li>• Submission of a verification report on remediation</li> <li>• Submission of a long term monitoring, maintenance and contingency plan for the remediation</li> <li>• Submission of a scheme to treat and remove solids from surface water run-off during construction work,</li> <li>• Submission of a scheme for foul and surface water drainage including oil and petrol interceptors, trapped</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

			<p>gullies and roof drainage sealed at ground level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Details of permanent wheel cleaning facilities at the site for during operation</li><li>• Condition specifying and restricting the types of waste to be processed at the site</li></ul>
--	--	--	---